

Serial No.: 09/656,074
Docket No.: 10655.9200

REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Office Action dated May 4, 2005 within two months. The Examiner rejects claims 1-24 and objects to claims 25-28. Applicants add claims 29-30, wherein claim 29 incorporates elements from the previously allowed claim 25 and claim 30 incorporates elements from the previously allowed claim 27. Applicants cancel claim 13 without prejudice to filing one or more claims having similar subject matter. Claims 1-12 and 14-30 are now pending in the application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 8-9, 13-16, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkinson, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,892,904 ("Atkinson") in view of Matias et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,681,017 ("Matias"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

With regard to independent claims 1 and 14, the Examiner asserts that "Atkinson fails to teach the formatting occurring in real time at the server"; however, the Examiner asserts that "Matias teaches that upon retrieving the data, formatting of the retrieved data occurs in real time at the server" (page 3, item 6).

Atkinson discloses a method for authenticating the source of a computer program, code, or an executable file received over a computer network. The Atkinson method is now commonly known to those skilled in the art as a "digital certificate". Specifically, Atkinson discloses a method wherein a publisher of a digital file registers their identity with a certification authority. The publisher then executes a code signing method which creates a hash "fingerprint" of the code. The hash and other information is encrypted with a private key and attached to a digital certificate along with a first public key corresponding to the private key. When a user chooses to download the certified file, the digital certificate is decrypted using a second public key corresponding to the publisher and the first public key is extracted. The first public key is then used to decrypt the publisher's signature and extract the hash. The hash for the file being downloaded is then calculated and compared to the signature hash. If the two hash values match, then the user can be assured that the file is the same file that was originally signed and certified.

While Atkinson provides some assurance of the source of the data, it is not completely secure because the keys required to decrypt the digital certificate and subsequently decrypt the signature, are located within the memory of the user's computer and digital certificate. The key used to decrypt the digital certificate is a public key located in the user's computer memory.

Serial No.: 09/656,074
Docket No.: 10655.9200

Once the digital certificate is decrypted using this public key, the key used to decrypt the signature is obtained from the digital certificate. If a publisher's unique private key that is used to encrypt the signature is unknowingly compromised, it can be used by any number of individuals to encrypt malicious code and distribute it under the legitimate publisher's digital certificate. This security problem is inherent to the advanced certification method as taught by Atkinson. Because there is not a real-time exchange of keys, independent of the file being downloaded, there is no assurance that the file is truly from a legitimate source. As such, neither Atkinson nor Matias disclose or suggest at least, "retrieving a preferences key from said server based on said authentication; and, decrypting a preferences file using said preferences key," as similarly recited by independent claims 1, 8 and 14.

Dependent claims 2-3, 9, 15-16 and 20 variously depend from independent claims 1, 8 and 14, and are differentiated from the cited references for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as in view of their own respective features.

The Examiner next rejects dependent claims 4, 6, 10-11, 17 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkinson and Matias and further in view of Wallent, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,366,912 ("Wallent"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Dependent claims 4, 6, 10-11, 17 and 23 variously depend from independent claims 1, 8 and 14, and are differentiated from the cited references for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as in view of their own respective features.

The Examiner next rejects dependent claims 5, 7, 12, and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkinson, Matias and Wallent and further in view of Houser, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,606,609 ("Houser"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Applicants assert that dependent claims 5, 7, 12, and 18-19 variously depend from independent claims 1, 8 and 14, and are differentiated from the cited references for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as in view of their own respective features.

The Examiner next rejects claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkinson in view of Matias and further in view of Asad, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,681,017 ("Asad"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants assert that dependent claim 21 depends from independent claim 1, and is differentiated from the cited references for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as in view of its own respective features.

Serial No.: 09/656,074
Docket No.: 10655.9200

The Examiner next rejects claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkinson in view of Matias and further in view of Walker, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,286,001 ("Walker"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants assert that dependent claim 22 depends from independent claim 8, and is differentiated from the cited references for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as in view of its own respective features.

The Examiner next rejects claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkinson in view of Matias and further in view of Kou, U.S. Patent No. 6,016,491 ("Kou"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants assert that independent claim 24 is differentiated from the cited references for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as in view of its own respective features.

In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims properly set forth that which Applicants regard as their invention and are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience, if that would help further prosecution of the subject Application. Applicants authorize and respectfully request that any fees due be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-2814.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6/16/05

Howard Sobelman
for Howard Sobelman
Reg. No. 39,038

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6228
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: hsobelman@swlaw.com